

SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress
1st Session

Vote No. 2

January 5, 1995, 7:14 p.m.
Page S-477 Temp. Record

CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT/Gift Ban-Lobbying Reform

SUBJECT: Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 . . . S. 2. Dole motion to table the Levin amendment No. 3.

ACTION: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO, 52-39

SYNOPSIS: Pertinent votes on this legislation include Nos. 3-11 and 13-14.

As introduced, S. 2, the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995, will extend 11 civil rights and labor laws to the Senate, the House of Representatives, and the instrumentalities of Congress.

The Levin amendment would enact the gift ban provisions from the Lobbying Disclosure Act conference report from the previous Congress (see 103d Congress, 2d session, vote No. 325) and would express the sense of the Senate that "the current lobbying regulation and disclosure laws are flawed and inadequate and that as soon as possible during the first session of the 104th Congress, the Senate should adopt legislation to reform these laws." The gift ban provisions would bar Members, officers, and employees of the Senate from accepting gifts from registered lobbyists, lobbying firms, agents of foreign principals, or anyone else, with exceptions.

During debate, Senator Dole moved to table the Levin amendment. The motion to table is not debatable; however, some debated preceded the making of the motion. Generally, those favoring the motion to table opposed the amendment; those opposing the motion to table favored the amendment.

Those favoring the motion to table contended:

We strongly oppose the addition of this amendment to S. 2. Our colleagues say we should support the gift ban provisions because the Senate, in the 103d Congress, passed them as part of the Gift Ban/Lobbying Reform conference report. We are not the 103d Congress. The Gift Ban Bill was a product of compromise, as is most legislation. With more Democratic Members in the 103d Congress, the bill that passed last year was more supportive of Democratic party priorities. This amendment tacitly recognizes that fact by totally dropping the lobbying provisions of that conference report, because those provisions contained very controversial

(See other side)

YEAS (52)			NAYS (39)			NOT VOTING (9)	
Republicans (49 or 96%)	Democrats (3 or 8%)		Republicans (2 or 4%)	Democrats (37 or 93%)		Republicans (2)	Democrats (7)
Ashcroft	Inhofe	Campbell	Abraham	Akaka	Glenn	Gramm- ²	Heflin- ²
Bennett	Jeffords	Johnston	Hatfield	Baucus	Graham	McCain- ²	Hollings- ²
Bond	Kassebaum	Lieberman		Biden	Harkin		Kerrey- ²
Brown	Kempthorne			Bingaman	Inouye		Leahy- ^{1AN}
Burns	Kyl			Boxer	Kennedy		Nunn- ³
Chafee	Lott			Bradley	Kerry		Robb- ²
Coats	Lugar			Breaux	Kohl		Simon- ^{2AN}
Cochran	Mack			Bryan	Lautenberg		
Cohen	McConnell			Bumpers	Levin		
Coverdell	Murkowski			Byrd	Mikulski		
Craig	Nickles			Conrad	Moseley-Braun		
D'Amato	Packwood			Daschle	Moynihan		
DeWine	Pressler			Dodd	Murray		
Dole	Roth			Dorgan	Pell		
Domenici	Santorum			Exon	Pryor		
Faircloth	Shelby			Feingold	Reid		
Frist	Simpson			Feinstein	Rockefeller		
Gorton	Smith			Ford	Sarbanes		
Grams	Snowe				Wellstone		
Grassley	Specter						
Gregg	Stevens						
Hatch	Thomas						
Helms	Thompson						
Hutchison	Thurmond						
	Warner						

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

restrictions on grassroots lobbying that had been included by Democratic conferees. However, party differences did not end with the issue of lobbying--several amendments were proposed to the Senate bill that were rejected, but which may pass if proposed this Congress, given the new membership. We intend to revisit the issue of banning gifts very soon, perhaps before May, hopefully once again in conjunction with the broader issue of lobbying reform. We are certain we can craft a better bill that is more representative of the views of the 104th Congress. S. 2 is about making Congress live under the same laws as everyone else in America; it is not about gifts, lobbying, or any other issue. The more we are able to keep the bill focused on this one issue, the better chance we will have of moving it expeditiously to enactment. The American people want us to pass this bill without delay, and we intend to give them what they want. Accordingly, we urge our colleagues to join us in tabling the Levin amendment.

Those opposing the motion to table contended:

The recent election, in very large measure, was about reforming Congress. Many of us were elected on the promise that we would make Congress more accountable. One major, necessary reform that we enthusiastically support is the requirement that Congress live under the same civil rights and labor laws that it imposes on the rest of America. We thus strongly support S. 2, and are desirous of its early passage. At the same time, we believe this bill can be improved by making other needed congressional reforms. One reform on which most Senators are presumably in agreement is the banning of gifts to Members. Last year the Senate passed a gift ban bill by a vote of 95-4. Most of those Senators who voted for that bill are still Members, and the pending amendment is nothing more and nothing less than the text of that bill. Surprisingly, though, some Senators have insisted that it is not yet time for this particular congressional reform, saying that further refinements are needed and that they fear passing it now will delay enactment of S. 2. For our part, we fear that excuses to delay consideration of the gift ban issue will continue indefinitely. We see no reason for delay, and thus urge our colleagues to reject the motion to table this amendment.